

Appl. No. 10/820,132

Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2008

REMARKS

The March 4, 2008 Office Action rejected all claims pending, 1-10 and 13-20, in the application. The present Amendment and Response amends claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 13 and 14 and cancels claims 15-20. No new matter is being presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments and review Applicant's comments.

In the Claims**Primary Reference****Bhandari et al. Reference**

Claims, 1, 3-6, 9-10, 13-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bhandari et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,891,940, issued May 10, 2005. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In general, Bhandari discloses a system to remotely view stored Caller ID information. For example, subscribers are able to access communication services through a data network. Such services include a Remote Access to Caller Identification (RACLID) system. The RACLID system enables subscribers to review caller identification information associated with incoming calls to the subscriber's telephone line from a remote location. (Bhandari column 1, lines 11-18)

Applicant's amended claims recite a system and method to implement user-defined telephony features, including receiving and placing of calls. In particular, Applicant's claims recite using a personal assistant and a remote policy application to place and receive calls at a remote location by connecting to an ICP at a local location. Essentially, as long as the user remains logged in to the personal assistant, calls will be directed to the user's remote location.

In contrast, Bhandari fails to teach, suggest or disclose a system and method for a remote user to receive and place calls from a remote location. Bhandari is a system for remotely accessing caller ID information only, not for receiving and placing calls. In fact, the Bhandari system (e.g., RACLID service) can be turned off such that caller ID information is not retrieved or stored during the calls. (Bhandari column 13, lines 16-35). If the Bhandari system were capable of receiving and placing calls, then turning off the system would mean no communication could occur. This is obviously not the

Appl. No. 10/820,132

Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2008

case because Bhandari is not directed towards receiving and placing calls from a remote locate, but rather is for storing and viewing caller ID information from a remote location.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections.

Secondary References

All remaining pending claims, 2, 7 and 8, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bhandari in view of various secondary references (claim 2 - Polychronidis et al., US Pub 2003/0018704; claim 7-Robinson et al., US Patent 5,533,102; and claim 8-Robinson in view of Miner et al., US Patent 5,652,789).

Claims 2, 7 and 8 depend from independent claims 1 and 3. For the reasons stated above, primary reference Bhandari fails to teach and every element of Applicant's claims as recited and by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 3, the remaining claims therefore are patentably distinct over primary reference Bhandari. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103 rejections and requests withdrawal of the same.

Appl. No. 10/820,132

Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections to all remaining claims pending in the application. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the application, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitel Networks Corporation

Date: June 4, 2008By: Michelle R. Whittington

Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.
Corporate IP Counsel
Reg. No. 43,844

MITEL NETWORKS CORPORATION
7300 W. Boston St.
Chandler, AZ 85226
Direct: (480) 961-9000 x21352
Facsimile: (480) 961-8073
Email: michelle_whittington@mitel.com

Page 10 of 10

WO 01/8343 A2	10/18/2001	Siemens
Examiner Signature	Date Considered	

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant. ¹ Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). ² See Kinds Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.uspto.gov or MPEP 901.04. ³ Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). ⁴ For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. ⁵ Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST.16 if possible. ⁶ Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language translation is attached.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.